

University of Groningen

Citizenship beyond politics

Bolzendahl, Catherine; Coffé, Hilde R.

Published in:
The British Journal of Sociology

DOI:
[10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01274.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01274.x)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2009

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bolzendahl, C., & Coffé, H. R. (2009). Citizenship beyond politics: the importance of political, civil and social rights and responsibilities among women and men. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 60(4), 763-791. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01274.x>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



Citizenship beyond politics: the importance of political, civil and social rights and responsibilities among women and men¹

Catherine Bolzendahl and Hilde Coffé

Abstract

Previous research has suggested that men are more engaged as citizens than are women. Yet, little is known about gender cleavages across a variety of citizenship norms. To what extent do men and women define citizenship differently? To address that question, this study examines the importance men and women assign various citizenship rights and responsibilities using 2004 ISSP data from 18 Western, industrialized nations. Using a disaggregated approach to understanding definitions of citizenship, we examine political, civil, and social rights and responsibilities. After controlling for a variety of demographic and attitudinal influences, we find that men and women are not different in their views regarding the importance of political responsibilities. However, women do view political rights as significantly more important than do men. Further, in comparison to men, women view both civil and social responsibilities and rights domains as significantly more important.

Keywords: Gender; citizenship norms; responsibilities; rights; Western industrialized democracies; public opinion

Introduction

Citizenship has always been a gendered concept. Less than one hundred years ago most women did not have the right to vote in nations that were otherwise considered democratic, and even the granting of that right did not secure women's equal access to or exercise of social, political, and civil power. Today, Western industrialized democracies have made great strides in promoting women and men's formal equality as citizens. Women's representation in parliaments has roughly doubled since 1970, and although early research suggested women were less participatory in politics, more recent research shows

little difference in terms of voting and other formal activities (Paxton, Kunovich and Hughes 2007; Burns 2007; Norris 2002). In the USA and Great Britain there is even evidence that women vote more than men (Parry, Moyser and Day 1992). Such positive trends must confront many important critiques. In general, *de jure* equality is quite different than *de facto* equality when it comes to men and women's citizenship, measured along a variety of dimensions (Harrison and Munn 2007; O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; Lister 1995, 2003) and women continue to have less social, political and civil power. Moreover, gender differences continue to exist in a number of areas such as contacting public officials, and discussing politics (Huckfeld and Sprague 1995; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Verba, Burns, and Schlozman 1997), and studies indicate that while gender gaps in some forms of participation are not large, they are persistent (Burns 2007; Parry, Moyser and Day 1992; Norris 2002). Research explaining this gap has pointed out that women are disadvantaged in resources that facilitate political activity. Namely, women and men have quite different demands on their time, both in terms of carework and employment, women and men are socialized to behave differently, and women still face a variety of forms of discrimination which may discourage or block their equal engagement as citizens (Burns 2007; Lister et al. 2007; Lovenduski 2005; Schlozman, Burns and Verba 1994). Yet, this research also has the tendency to take the gender gap for granted and question or control for what makes women 'different' from the male norm (Bourque and Grossholtz 1998), not fully acknowledging that such different perspectives may be 'good' for citizenship overall (Young 1997, 2004; Phillips 2004). Some scholars have indeed noted the neglect in addressing women's vibrant participation in informal political efforts and organizations (Sarvasy and Siim 1994; Bourque and Grossholtz 1998; Harrison and Munn 2007; Siim 2000) and pointed out that we should consider potentially important gender differences in the definition of citizenship in the first place (Harrison and Munn 2007).

Here we place such definitional issues regarding citizenship at the forefront, recognizing that citizenship participation may represent a variety of beliefs about rights and behaviours. By analysing whether men and women differ in the importance they place on various citizenship indicators, we can examine the extent to which there is a gender cleavage in conceptualizations of 'good citizenship'. Whereas political and civil participation has been studied extensively, much less research has focused on the broader public's conceptualizations of citizenship. In our focus on definitions of citizenship we investigate opinions toward both responsibilities and rights as inherently linked to and foundational for democratic citizenship. We also distinguish between political, civil, and social responsibilities and rights. Whereas such differences have been emphasized in theories of citizenship (Marshall 1950; Lister 2003), empirical analyses of these distinct dimensions presently remain underdeveloped. Further, current research is often limited to one or a small number of nations

(Dalton 2008b; Conover, Searing, and Crewe 2004). In this study, we examine these issues across 18 Western, industrialized democracies using data from the 2004 Citizenship module from the International Social Survey Program, thus greatly increasing the scope and generalizability of our findings (Austria, Belgium (Flanders), France, Germany, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Great Britain, Ireland, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the USA). Our results show that men and women do not differ in their emphasis on *political responsibilities*, but that women place significantly greater weight on *political rights*. Women also place more importance on *social* and *civil* dimensions of citizenship than do men, both in term of rights and duties. Thus our tests allow us to corroborate claims by other scholars that a narrow focus on political citizenship (e.g., voting), may underestimate women's citizenship norms by failing to capture women's greater investment in civil and social rights and responsibilities (e.g., Harrison and Munn 2007; Bourque and Grossholtz 1998; Lister 1998; Sarvasy and Siim 1994).

Our paper is structured as follows. We begin by briefly reviewing the concept of citizenship and citizenship norms. As mentioned, our central question relates to gender differences with respect to citizenship norms, thus we next present in more detail insights on gender and citizenship, as well as our expectations based on these insights. Thereafter, our data and measurements are introduced. The analyses are presented in the following sections. We conclude with a brief summary of the results, a further discussion of our findings, and some suggestions for further research.

What is citizenship?

Though scholars have argued about citizenship for centuries, even today citizenship is a highly contested concept. At its most basic, citizenship entails membership in a community, the rights and obligations that flow from that membership and equality of status to other members (Marshall 1950). It is not only about the relationship between individuals and the state but also about the relationship between individual citizens within a community. Within these relationships, citizenship entails both rights and obligations. The balance between rights and duties, however, is often a source of major debates (Lister 2003; Janoski 1998).

Responsibilities and rights

As a whole, *rights*-based approaches to citizenship are grounded in the liberal political tradition of equality of the individual, and the right to participate in decision-making in social, economic, cultural and political life is seen as basic

to the lexicon of rights-based citizenship. In his essay on citizenship rights, Marshall (1950: 10–11) notes three types of rights²: civil, political and social. Civil rights guarantee individual freedom, such as liberty of person and freedom of speech, thought and faith. Political rights secure an individual's participation in the exercise of political power. Finally, social rights protect a minimum of economic welfare and security, and have been shown to be important for guaranteeing the effective use of civil and political rights, including promises of autonomy (Orloff 1993; Esping-Andersen 2002; O'Connor 1993).

Yet citizenship also implies *duties*. This perspective emerges from more ancient notions of civic republicanism, but also more recent work on 'communitarianism' (Sandel 1996), wherein the liberal (rights) perspective was challenged by a communitarian approach emphasizing citizenship obligations over rights (Mead 1986; Novak and Cogan 1987). While not all scholars agree, it is generally accepted that citizenship is not only passive, but also agentic, requiring the fulfilment of a variety of responsibilities (Delanty 2000: 19; Faulks 2000). Empirical research also suggests that citizens themselves think of both right and responsibilities as valid components of citizenship (Conover, Searing and Crewe 2004).

Domains of citizenship: political, civil, social

A variety of work has incorporated Marshall's (1950) civil, political, and social components into further research on citizenship (O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; Lister 1995). A great deal of work focuses on political rights – the right to vote, to participate in political organizations, and engage in a variety of forms of governance (e.g., Paxton, Kunovich and Hughes 2007; Dalton 2008b; Manza and Brooks 1998; Pintor and Gratschew 2002) – while less research has focused on individual conceptions of citizenship based on social and civil rights.³ Here we note that while previous work establishes the importance of these rights in general, it is typically not explicitly focusing on support as expressed by average citizens.

Although it has been less explicitly outlined in the literature, responsibilities to the community and the state may, like rights, be differentiated according to political, civil, and social responsibilities. For example, many nations legally require citizens to vote (Lijphart 1997), and almost all nations take steps to encourage and enable more widespread voting (Lijphart 1984). Often, it is taken for granted that 'good citizens' will have a sense of civil responsibility: obeying laws of the community, paying taxes and serving in public capacities (McKinnon 2000; Dalton 2008a; Harrison and Munn 2007). Finally, discourses surrounding social responsibilities are also prevalent. Increasingly in post-industrial societies, responsibilities such as caring for others and maintaining a clean and safe environment are discussed as citizenship duties (Inglehart and Welzel 2005; Janoski 1998).

Gender and definitions of citizenship

Having established the ways in which citizenship is both a set of rights and of responsibilities, and comprises political, civil and social elements, we now turn to a more explicit discussion of the relationship of gender to citizenship. In particular, we argue that recognizing the myriad of issues comprising citizenship is especially important for understanding this relationship. Theoretically, the claim that the definition of citizenship itself is gendered, that is, based on a standard best suited to a traditionally masculine life course is not new. A variety of political theorists have deconstructed the meaning of citizenship and highlighted the ways in which definitions of citizenship promote or challenge universalist ideals versus fragmented identities, create hierarchies of duties and rights that systematically disadvantage groups such as women and minorities, downplay women's political agency, and focus only on the most public, visible forms (Lister 1998, 2003; Phillips 2004; Sarvasy and Siim 1994; Siim 2000; Young 1997, 2004). Such far-reaching critiques suggest a variety of research agendas beyond the scope of this paper. However, they also highlight the lack of empirical research incorporating and testing the extent to which these issues exist in the minds of average citizens. Only in the case of conventional political citizenship behaviour has there been an extensive prior empirical literature, yet by extrapolating from related research we offer hypotheses below.

Gender and political citizenship

The majority of previous empirical studies of citizenship have focused more narrowly on formal political participation and engagement. These studies have often found that women are less participatory (e.g., Burns, Schlozman and Verba 1997, 2001; but see also a review by Burns 2007). Some recent research suggests for voting, the gender gap may now be non-existent (Parry, Moyser and Day 1992; Seltzer, Newman and Leighton 1997), though small, persistent gaps are found in other forms like attending political party meetings, with women less participatory even when considering a variety of controls for the respondent's demographic and attitudinal characteristics (Norris 2002; Burns 2007). Regardless, none of these studies examines differences in the level of importance men and women assign to political rights and responsibilities. Perhaps more relevant to this question are a number of studies showing that women have lower levels of political interest and knowledge than men (Kenski and Jamieson 2000; Paxton, Kunovich and Hughes 2007; Verba, Burns and Schlozman 1997). Given this, we expect,

H1: Women will place less importance on political citizenship responsibilities and rights in comparison to men.

Gender and civil citizenship

Civil citizenship involves upholding the rules of a democratic society and is in many ways as crucial to the healthy functioning of the polity as formal political participation. Paying taxes, abiding laws and respecting the personal and property rights of others form the basic contours of what is considered as 'good citizenship'. Research has found women are generally more law-abiding (Steffensmeier and Allan 1996; Tyler 2006), and are more likely to support policies that regulate and protect citizens, consumers and the environment (Shapiro and Mahajan 1986; Diekmann, Eagly, and Kulesa 2002). Studies among adolescents also revealed that females are more likely to support the rights of immigrants (Hooghe and Wilkenfeld 2008; Torney-Purta, Wilkenfeld, and Barber 2008). Considering this evidence suggests,

H2: Women will view civil citizenship responsibilities and rights as more important than men.

Gender and social citizenship

Women are more likely to face higher burdens of care work, which prevent fuller participation in 'traditional' political citizenship (Schlozman, Burns, and Verba 1994). These burdens and women's involvement in social work may lead them to place more emphasis on social aspects of citizenship, both responsibilities and rights. Previous research has found that when asked to name and prioritize important political issues women tend to focus more so on family and cultural issues, while men place higher priority on the economy or defence (Campbell 2004; Inglehart and Norris 2000; Manza and Brooks 1999). Inglehart and Norris (2000) claim that although women were once thought of as being more conservative than men, this is no longer the case, and women have moved to the left, especially on social and cultural issues. Thus,

H3: In comparison to men, women will find social citizenship responsibilities and rights to be more important.

Sources of gender cleavage

The above review of previous work helps in forming general expectations for gender differences in approaches to the meaning of citizenship, and we expect men and women to approach citizenship differently. However, it still leaves the question of which characteristics and experiences lead men and women define citizenship differently. Previous research provides some suggestions as to these sources of differences and refers to socio-economic characteristics, attitudes, and gendered life course experiences. The majority of the previous research

has focused on conventional political citizenship more generally, and formal political *participation* in particular. Thus, the extent to which patterns in political participation will describe patterns in definitions of citizenship, particularly those outside of the formal political realm, is less clear.

Socio-economic characteristics

A major source of a gender differences may be due to disparities in women's and men's socio-economic resources. Men's greater tendency to be in the workforce, work longer hours, and be employed in high-level jobs (Schlozman, Burns and Verba 1999) has been found to increase their participation relative to women, and by extension we might expect these increased economic resources to increase the value men place on the public sphere (Schlozman, Burns and Verba 1994) and thus on formal political citizenship. Further, while men and women are increasingly equal in receipt of a college degree, men are still more likely to earn a graduate degree, which also tends to increase participation (Verba, Burns and Schlozman 2003), and by the same logic may increase the importance men place on political citizenship. In comparison, women's relatively lower economic status may increase the importance with which they view civil and social rights and responsibilities. Indeed the expansion of civil and social citizenship may be a means for women to increase their economic standing, such as through welfare state policy (Casper, Garfinkel and McLanahan 1994; DiPrete and McManus 2000; Young 2004).

Another important potential influence may be family status: marriage and parenthood. Pressures on women to specialize in the 'private sphere' intensify when women become wives and mothers, and thus interest in and availability for public citizenship may be further diminished (Hochschild 1989; Schlozman, Burns and Verba 1994). Regardless of the national context and system of social policies, women do more unpaid house and care work (Bittman et al. 2003; Knudsen and Wærness 2008). Mothers often have fewer economic resources (depending more heavily on a partner's wages) and single mothers are especially at risk of poverty (Kilkey and Bradshaw 1999; Esping-Andersen 2002). These pressures may lead women to view political citizenship as less important than men, but may simultaneously increase an emphasis on civil and social citizenship. As more firmly attached to family and community and as primary caregivers, women may find it more crucial to emphasize safe communities, taxes for public goods (including childcare and education), and support for the poor.

Attitudes and ideology

If it is primarily experiences with unequal family and economic roles, controlling for these should eliminate or greatly reduce gender differences in

definitions of citizenship. However, prior research, especially on participation, has also emphasized the importance of related attitudes and ideologies (Verba, Burns and Schlozman 1997). In the USA, Verba, Burns and Schlozman (1997) found that controlling for socio-economic characteristics does not fully mediate the gender gap. It is only once women's lower levels of political information, interest, and efficacy are controlled for that the gap in political participation disappears. Hence it is important to consider a variety of attitudinal and ideological measures when trying to explain gender differences in citizenship norms.

Previous studies revealed that socially and politically disadvantaged groups (e.g., racial minorities and women) have less trust in institutions and are perceived as being more easily taken advantage of (Abramson 1983; Banducci, Donovan and Karp 1999; Chanley, Rudolph and Rahn 2000; Rosenthal 1995). Such differences may undergird women's lower levels of political participation, since political efficacy and trust correlates with civic engagement, membership and political participation (Burns 2007; Lovenduski 2005; Putnam 2000; Verba, Burns and Schlozman 1997). The higher the institutional trust citizens have, the stronger their social and political involvement (Dalton 2006; DiFrancesco and Gielman 1984; Putnam 1995; Howard and Gilbert 2008). In addition to trust in institutions, social trust has been related to citizen involvement. DiFrancesco and Gitelman (1984: 610) note that 'trust is essential to cooperative public activity.' Thus, gender differences in citizenship beliefs and practices may have strong ties to issues of social and political trust and political efficacy.

Finally, women's greater affiliation with leftist political ideologies and leftist political parties (Caul 1999; Hayes, McAllistair and Studlar 2000) may (partly) explain women's greater support for civil and social rights and responsibilities given the greater focus of leftist parties on equalizing civil and social rights (Erikson and Tedin 2005; Sherrod 2008). Yet, women's affiliation with left-leaning politics might increase a gender gap in political responsibilities, as people affiliated with right-leaning parties on average participate less often in non-institutional forms of politics (Dalton 2006; Stolle and Hooghe 2005).

Data and measurement

Based on previous theory and research, we now turn to an analysis of whether there is a gender gap in citizenship norms. We utilize data from the 2004 International Social Survey Program (ISSP) module on Citizenship. The ISSP is a cross-national collaboration of surveys, each of which is fielded by a scientific organization within the member nation, mainly as part of a larger random survey of the adult non-institutionalized population (ISSP 2004). Detailed information about the sampling procedures and any deviations are

available in the study report (Scholz, Harkness, and Faaß 2008). We look at Western industrialized countries and include in our analysis 18 countries: Austria, Belgium (Flanders),⁴ France, Germany, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Great Britain, Ireland, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the USA, resulting in 25,263 respondents. Listwise deletion of observations with missing data on the independent variables was used (Allison 2001). For dependent variable scales respondents were only dropped when they did not answer any of the questions. The number of valid responses was then divided by the number of possible responses. Missing values remaining in any scale were dropped to arrive at a consistent sample across subject areas. The final sample size is 20,560.⁵ Before turning to the analyses, in the next sections we discuss the dependent and independent variables. Coding, mean, proportions, and standard deviations of all dependent and independent variables are presented in Table I. Gender differences are noted and will be discussed more fully in the results below.

Dependent variables: measuring citizenship norms

The ISSP offers the possibility to investigate the two-dimensional structure of citizenship: responsibilities and rights. We base the scales below on results from factor analyses, alpha scores, and prior research and theory.⁶ The analysis (not presented here) of individual items supports the conclusions presented in the results below.⁷ As is more generally the case for survey research, none of the single items can fully speak to the complexity that underlies conceptions of good citizenship and the meaning of rights in a democratic society, nor can we be sure that all respondents interpret the questions in the same way. The analysis of scales helps in this regard by utilizing more than one item to constitute a theoretical category.

Citizenship responsibilities

With respect to responsibilities, the respondents were asked how they think a 'good citizen' should behave. The ISSP asks: 'To be a good citizen, how important is it for a person to . . .' From nine items in this series we create three dependent variables: political, social and civil responsibilities.⁸ Theoretically responsibilities may be fulfilled according to political, civil, and social aspects and the division of responsibilities into these three forms was confirmed by principal factor analysis (available upon request). Each item was originally scored from 1 if considered extremely unimportant to 7 if considered extremely important. The items were grouped to form additive scales, recoded with zero as the base value. First, a scale of *political responsibilities* ($\alpha = 0.63$)

Table I: Means/proportions for all variables (standard deviations in parentheses) across 18 industrialized democracies

	Range	Men	Women	Sig. Test ^a
Dependent variables				
Political responsibilities	0–6	4.17 (1.22)	4.20 (1.23)	n.s.
Civil responsibilities	0–6	4.83 (1.26)	5.18 (1.05)	*
Social responsibilities	0–6	4.14 (1.16)	4.42 (1.10)	*
Political rights	0–6	5.18 (1.00)	5.33 (0.91)	*
Social and civil rights	0–6	5.31 (0.90)	5.45 (0.81)	*
Independent variables				
University degree (ref: less than degree)	0/1	0.18 (0.39)	0.16 (0.37)	n.s.
Age	18–97	48.25 (16.56)	47.29 (16.66)	n.s.
Marital status (ref: never married)				
Married, living together or widowed	0/1	0.68 (0.47)	0.68 (0.47)	n.s.
Divorced or separated	0/1	0.08 (0.27)	0.11 (0.31)	*
Employment status (ref: not in labor force)				
Full time employment	0/1	0.61 (0.49)	0.36 (0.48)	*
Part-time employment	0/1	0.34 (0.47)	0.45 (0.50)	*
Spouse employed full time (ref: < full time, no spouse)	0/1	0.26 (0.44)	0.44 (0.50)	*
Occupation (ref: elementary, no occupation)				
Professionals and managers	0/1	0.29 (0.45)	0.21 (0.41)	*
Technicians and associate professionals	0/1	0.14 (0.35)	0.16 (0.36)	n.s.
Service workers and clerks	0/1	0.12 (0.32)	0.33 (0.47)	*
Skilled agriculture and craft workers	0/1	0.33 (0.47)	0.09 (0.29)	*
Urban resident (ref: not urban)	0/1	0.25 (0.44)	0.26 (0.44)	n.s.
Children in household (ref: adult hh)	0/1	0.31 (0.46)	0.35 (0.48)	*
Religious attendance	0–7	2.03 (2.16)	2.55 (2.26)	*
Religious denomination (ref: Protestant)				
Roman Catholic	0/1	0.36 (0.48)	0.40 (0.49)	n.s.
Other religion	0/1	0.06 (0.23)	0.06 (0.24)	n.s.
No religion	0/1	0.26 (0.44)	0.18 (0.39)	*
Political efficacy	0–4	1.70 (1.11)	1.61 (1.09)	*
Trust in government	0–4	1.93 (1.03)	1.86 (1.00)	*
Social trust	0–3	1.52 (0.70)	1.48 (0.69)	*
Political ideology/affiliation (ref: centre)				
Left	0/1	0.29 (0.45)	0.29 (0.45)	n.s.
Right	0/1	0.27 (0.44)	0.23 (0.42)	*
Other	0/1	0.28 (0.45)	0.32 (0.42)	*
Observations	20,560	9,943	10,617	

Source: International Survey Program 2004.

Notes: ^a Significance tests conducted through regressions with robust standard errors clustered by nation; * $p < 0.05$.

assesses how important it is for good citizens to ‘always vote in elections,’ be ‘active in social and political associations,’ and ‘keep a watch on the actions of government’. Second, support for *civil responsibilities* ($\alpha = 0.71$) is the importance that one ‘never try to evade taxes’ and ‘always obey laws’. Third, *social responsibilities* ($\alpha = 0.73$) measures how important it is for good citizens to ‘try to understand the reasoning of people with other opinions,’ ‘choose products for political, ethical or environmental reasons,’ ‘help people in your country who are worse off than yourself,’ and ‘help people in the world who are worse off than yourself’.

Citizenship rights

Whereas the scarce previous research on citizenship norms was limited to the questions on good citizenship and thus to citizenship duties (Dalton 2008b; Denters, Gabriel, and Torcal 2007), we also examine beliefs about what *rights* people should receive. From the ISSP we take five items which ask the respondents how important they consider a particular right. The items range from 1 if considered extremely unimportant to 7 if considered extremely important. It was possible to create two additive scales from these items. A scale of *political rights* ($\alpha = 0.69$) asks about the importance that 'politicians take into account the views of citizens before making decisions' and that 'people be given more opportunities to participate in public decision making'. Second we create an additive scale of support for *civil and social rights*.⁹ The scale ($\alpha = 0.74$) combines three items: how important it is that 'all citizens have an adequate standard of living', that 'government authorities respect and protect the rights of minorities', and that 'government authorities treat everybody equally regardless of their position in society'. As with the responsibility scales, both rights scales were recoded with zero as the base value.

Independent variables: demographic and attitudinal items

The main focus in this study, *gender*, is measured as a dichotomous variable with men coded as 0 and 1 for female respondents. Further, since women and men typically have differing life-course patterns and responsibilities, we control for a variety of socio-economic characteristics that may explain the bulk of any gender differences in citizenship norms. *Education* represents both individual socio-economic resources, e.g., labour market power, and socialization into a variety of social and political norms (Manza and Brooks 1999; Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Schlozman, Burns, and Verba 1994). It is measured as a dichotomous variable indicating whether the individual has attained a university degree.¹⁰ *Age* is a continuous control variable. We know age increases voting (with diminishing returns), thus it may also increase the salience of citizenship norms as suggested by related research (Dalton 2006). We also introduced a squared value for age to control for non-linearities in the effect as a life-course control.

Previous research has indicated employment and occupational status influence political participation, and may account for gender differences in levels of political participation so it may also account for gender differences in citizenship norms (Beckwith 1986; Manza and Brooks 1998; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). *Employment status* represents three categories: full-time employment, part-time employment and not employed. The latter category includes amongst others unemployed people, care workers, students, retired people, and disabled people. Some work has suggested that flexibility in work hours increases the amount of leisure time available to individuals and thus for

participation (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995; Schlozman, Burns, and Verba 1999). This is of particular concern for women whose dual roles in the waged and non-waged labour forces leave little room for flexibility (Smith 1997). Next to the respondents' employment, we also introduce the *spouse's employment*, which compares those respondents whose spouse is employed full time to all others.¹¹ *Occupation* has been operationalized on the basis of the 1988 International Standard Classification of Occupation (ISCO) and distinguishes 5 groups: (1) managers and professionals, (2) technicians and associate professionals, (3) clerks, service workers, shop and market sales workers, and armed forces, (4) skilled agriculture workers, craft workers, and plant and machine operators and assemblers, and (5) elementary occupations and those with no occupation.¹²

Marital status is coded into three categories: (1) respondents who are married, are living together as married or who are widowed, (2) respondents who are divorced or separated, and (3) respondents who are single and have never been married. We know that marriage increases time spent in formal community organizations and neighbourhood, and fosters political activity (Hooghe 2003; Putnam 2000; Verba, Burns, and Schlozman 1997). The *household composition* is a dichotomous variable distinguishing households with children from other household compositions.¹³ Having children may change the way one views citizenship, and some work suggests people with children tend to have more social attitudes, such as being more tolerant towards immigrants, than people without children (Coffé and Geys 2007). The *place of residence* is self-assessed as either rural (0) or urban (1) residence. Membership in a denomination and religiosity may convey particular messages about appropriate behaviour as citizens, and particular gender role beliefs (Bolzendahl and Brooks 2005; Evans 1997; Heath, Taylor and Toka 1995). Thus we control for *religious denomination* according to four categories: no religious denomination, Roman Catholic, Protestant, and other religion. *Religious attendance* is a continuous variable ranging from (0) never to (7) several time a week. There has been consistent evidence of a positive relationship between religious faiths and political and social involvement (e.g. Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Putnam 2000).

In addition to socio-economic variables, we also introduce four attitudinal/ideological variables: political and social trust, political efficacy, and political ideology.¹⁴ Through the inclusion of both political and social trust, we control for both vertical trust and horizontal trust, referring, respectively to trust toward government and the institutions of the state and to trust that is shared among people. Gender disparities in the importance of citizenship norms may reflect gender differences in social and political trust more generally (Norris 1999; Abramson 1983; Chanley, Rudolph, and Rahn 2000; Rosenthal 1995). Since women often report feeling less politically efficacious, this may also explain any gaps in norms (Abramson 1983; Banducci, Donovan, and Karp

1999; Chanley, Rudolph, and Rahn 2000). Bennett and Bennett (1989) show that political dispositions such as the perception that government is attentive to public opinion and belief that it is responsive to the people are important predictors for gender. Finally, gender differences in perceptions of citizenship may reflect broader political ideological differences regarding the role of state intervention in the economy and society (Caul 1999; Hayes, McAllistair, and Studlar 2000; Campbell 2004).

Our indicator of *political trust* is agreement on a Likert-type scale from 1–5 that ‘most of the time we can trust people in government to do what is right.’ *Political efficacy* adds two similarly scaled items measuring disagreement that ‘people like me don’t have any say about what the government does,’ and ‘I don’t think the government cares much what people like me think’ ($\alpha = 0.74$). One question is used to measure *social trust*: ‘Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?’ The possible answers range from (1) ‘People can almost always be trusted’ to (4) ‘You almost always can’t be too careful in dealing with people’. All answers have been reversed so that higher values refer to more trust or efficacy, and recoded to start at zero. *Political ideology* is measured based on an item derived by the ISSP research team from country-specific questions about political party affiliation, political ideology and/or both. Given the high number of missing values on this item (e.g., all are missing in Flanders and 37 per cent in Austria), the variable was recoded into four categories: left, right, centre and ‘other’. The ‘other’ category comprises all the missing, those with no party affiliation and those who say some other party. While neither the measure nor the coding is ideal, it does allow some control for political ideology. Notably, excluding this measure does not affect the main results or conclusions.

Finally, we control for context, broadly defined, by including country dummy variables. A gender gap in citizenship norms may be shaped by contextual factors beyond the scope of our analyses, thus it is important to account for possible macro influences such as the type of welfare state, since they may influence citizenship norms (Lister et al. 2007).

Analytical strategy

In the analyses below we examine gender differences in the importance of political, civil and social responsibilities and rights. Each dependent variable is analysed using OLS regression. There are three models for each set of citizenship norms: a base model containing gender and socio-economic controls, a model including attitudinal variables, and finally a model that includes any significant gender interaction in the previous variables. Interactions that were not significant (at $p < 0.05$ level) are dropped from the model in the interests of theoretical and methodological parsimony, though including all interactions does not significantly change the results. Interactions were tested across all

demographic and attitudinal measures and based on evidence from separate models for men and women (not presented here). Note that the main effect of gender in models with interactions effects and without them cannot be directly compared. When a gender interaction effect is included this transforms the gender main effect such that it represents the gender difference among people in the categories being referenced by the interaction. We explain this in greater detail when discussing these results below. All models include country dummy-variables not shown in the tables, but available upon request.¹⁵ As a further control for country-specific influences all standard errors are robust and clustered according to nation.¹⁶

Descriptive statistics: gender differences in means

In addition to describing levels of our dependent and independent variables, Table I is a useful first step in understanding potential gender differences. We find significant differences between men and women for all citizenship norms but political responsibilities, with women scoring significantly higher than men. This supports our hypotheses that women view social and civil citizenship as more important than man. There is little support for the first hypothesis about women's lesser emphasis on political citizenship. Support for the first hypothesis regarding women's political citizenship is meagre and even counter to expectations. There is no difference in regard to political responsibilities, and women actually view political rights as more important than men do.

Across many socio-economic controls, men and women are significantly different. Differences are in accordance with previous literature, and thus will not be elaborated here. Notably, women tend to have fewer economic resources (employment and occupation), but greater potential burdens on resources (being divorced/separated, living with children) (Siim 2000; Lister 2003; Lovenduski 2005). Turning to the attitudinal control variables, we also observe distinct differences between men and women. Women feel less politically efficacious and have substantially less trust in government and politicians than men do. They also show less trust in other people than men. Women are not more likely to be leftist, but are less likely to be affiliated with the right and the 'other' political category.

Citizenship responsibilities

Having illustrated the descriptive statistics of the variables included in our models and having shown the relevant gender differences, we now turn to our multivariate analyses. These analyses explore the extent to which gender differences in citizenship norms may be due to socio-economic characteristic and/or attitudes as discussed earlier. We will start with a description of the citizenship responsibilities, and turn to the citizenship rights thereafter.

Political responsibilities

The first dependent variable is a scale of the importance of political responsibilities, such as voting, participating in political organizations, and watching the government. The results are presented in Table II.

As with the descriptive statistics there is no significant difference between men and women in terms of the importance of political responsibilities in the socio-economic and attitudinal models. The last model which presents significant interaction effects by gender shows that some interesting gender patterns occur. Specifically, having a university degree and being in a professional occupation increases the importance of political citizenship

Table II: OLS regression analyses of political citizenship responsibilities in 18 Western industrialized democracies (robust standard errors in parentheses); $N = 20,560$

	Socio-economic		Attitudes		Gender interactions	
Gender						
Female	-0.025	(0.035)	0.001	(0.034)	-0.016	(0.030)
Socio-economic controls						
University degree	0.103**	(0.031)	0.035	(0.027)	-0.017	(0.026)
Age	0.027***	(0.004)	0.026***	(0.004)	0.026***	(0.004)
Age-squared	-0.000**	(0.000)	-0.000**	(0.000)	-0.000**	(0.000)
Married/living as/widow	-0.013	(0.038)	-0.007	(0.036)	-0.002	(0.036)
Divorced/separated	-0.037	(0.039)	-0.021	(0.040)	-0.017	(0.039)
Employed full time	-0.047	(0.028)	-0.047	(0.026)	-0.047	(0.027)
Not in labour force	-0.014	(0.025)	-0.005	(0.025)	-0.002	(0.025)
Spouse employed full time	0.032	(0.021)	0.018	(0.022)	0.020	(0.022)
Professional occupations	0.083	(0.042)	0.033	(0.038)	-0.026	(0.039)
Technical occupations	0.078	(0.043)	0.033	(0.040)	0.023	(0.041)
Service occupations	0.040	(0.042)	0.027	(0.043)	0.027	(0.044)
Agric./craft occupations	-0.088*	(0.040)	-0.080*	(0.038)	-0.105*	(0.039)
Urban resident	0.013	(0.022)	-0.010	(0.024)	-0.009	(0.024)
Children in household	-0.033	(0.025)	-0.030	(0.025)	-0.029	(0.025)
Church attendance	0.057***	(0.007)	0.052***	(0.006)	0.053***	(0.006)
Catholic	-0.052	(0.038)	-0.038	(0.037)	0.010	(0.043)
Other religion	-0.053	(0.050)	-0.027	(0.045)	-0.029	(0.046)
No religion	-0.080	(0.048)	-0.071	(0.043)	-0.065	(0.044)
Attitudes						
Political efficacy			0.122***	(0.015)	0.121***	(0.014)
Trust in government			0.056**	(0.019)	0.057**	(0.019)
Social trust			0.034**	(0.010)	0.033**	(0.010)
Left political affiliation			0.140***	(0.027)	0.138***	(0.026)
Right political affiliation			-0.007	(0.046)	-0.004	(0.046)
Other political affiliation			-0.240***	(0.049)	-0.239***	(0.049)
Gender Interactions						
Female*university degree					0.102*	(0.041)
Female*professional occup.					0.110**	(0.036)
Female*Catholic					-0.092*	(0.037)
Constant	3.584	(0.122)	3.234	(0.109)	3.240	(0.108)
R-squared	0.137		0.167		0.168	

Source: ISSP 2004.

Notes: * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

responsibilities more for women than it does for men. Catholic women view political responsibilities as less important than Catholic men, which may indicate more traditional gender ideologies about women and men's private and public roles among Catholics.

Civil responsibilities

The next set of responsibilities considered is the importance of paying taxes and obeying the law as part of being a good citizen, referring to civil responsibilities. As shown in Table III, the socio-economic and attitudinal models

Table III: OLS regression analyses of civil citizenship responsibilities in 18 Western industrialized democracies (robust standard errors in parentheses); $N = 20,560$

	Socio-economic		Attitudes		Gender interactions	
Gender						
Female	0.275***	(0.027)	0.283***	(0.027)	0.301***	(0.028)
Socio-economic controls						
University degree	-0.074*	(0.030)	-0.087***	(0.028)	-0.088***	(0.028)
Age	0.007	(0.004)	0.009*	(0.004)	0.009*	(0.004)
Age-squared	0.000	(0.000)	-0.000	(0.000)	-0.000	(0.000)
Married/living as/widow	0.119***	(0.038)	0.114***	(0.037)	0.107*	(0.037)
Divorced/separated	0.027	(0.035)	0.032	(0.035)	0.032	(0.036)
Employed full time	0.026	(0.019)	0.023	(0.019)	0.031	(0.017)
Not in labour force	0.050*	(0.023)	0.050	(0.025)	0.054*	(0.025)
Spouse employed full time	0.015	(0.023)	0.014	(0.023)	-0.034	(0.039)
Professional occupations	0.005	(0.032)	0.001	(0.030)	-0.003	(0.030)
Technical occupations	0.042	(0.032)	0.037	(0.031)	0.032	(0.031)
Service occupations	0.099***	(0.018)	0.099***	(0.018)	0.094***	(0.018)
Agric./craft occupations	0.013	(0.036)	0.019	(0.037)	0.014	(0.037)
Urban resident	-0.002	(0.025)	-0.004	(0.026)	-0.004	(0.026)
Children in household	0.008	(0.024)	0.008	(0.023)	0.005	(0.024)
Church attendance	0.038***	(0.009)	0.034***	(0.009)	0.045***	(0.012)
Catholic	-0.101***	(0.023)	-0.104***	(0.022)	-0.106***	(0.022)
Other religion	-0.045	(0.032)	-0.042	(0.029)	-0.045	(0.029)
No religion	-0.209***	(0.038)	-0.195***	(0.036)	-0.192***	(0.037)
Attitudes						
Political efficacy			0.029***	(0.010)	0.029***	(0.009)
Trust in government			0.107***	(0.019)	0.106***	(0.019)
Social trust			-0.020	(0.015)	-0.020	(0.015)
Left political affiliation			-0.014	(0.026)	-0.012	(0.026)
Right political affiliation			-0.034	(0.033)	-0.033	(0.033)
Other political affiliation			0.042	(0.035)	0.044	(0.034)
Gender interactions						
Female*spouse f-t emp.					0.090*	(0.042)
Female*church attend.					-0.021*	(0.008)
Constant	4.720	(0.098)	4.492	(0.104)	4.476	(0.108)
R-squared	0.126		0.136		0.137	

Source: ISSP 2004.

Notes: * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

indicate that women find these responsibilities to be significantly more important than men. Controls for socio-economic and attitudinal characteristics do not mediate the difference and only two of the effects vary by gender. For women, having a spouse employed full time increases the importance of civil citizenship responsibilities, while for men, attending church has a stronger positive effect on civil responsibility importance than it does for women.

Social responsibilities

With respect to our third type of responsibilities (Table IV), women in the socio-economic and attitudinal models view social citizenship responsibilities

Table IV: OLS regression analyses of social citizenship responsibilities in 18 Western industrialized democracies (robust standard errors in parentheses); $N = 20,560$

	Socio-economic		Attitudes		Gender interactions	
Gender						
Female	0.214***	(0.032)	0.223***	(0.029)	0.267***	(0.024)
Socio-economic controls						
University degree	0.167***	(0.027)	0.099***	(0.025)	0.098***	(0.025)
Age	0.003	(0.004)	0.001	(0.004)	0.001	(0.004)
Age-squared	-0.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)	0.000	(0.000)
Married/living As/widow	-0.073*	(0.029)	-0.062*	(0.026)	-0.062*	(0.025)
Divorced/separated	-0.005	(0.025)	0.011	(0.024)	0.011	(0.024)
Employed full time	-0.101***	(0.032)	-0.090*	(0.031)	-0.090*	(0.032)
Not in labour force	-0.032	(0.030)	-0.018	(0.029)	-0.018	(0.029)
Spouse employed full time	0.025	(0.017)	0.014	(0.018)	0.017	(0.018)
Professional occupations	0.147***	(0.041)	0.116***	(0.038)	0.111***	(0.037)
Technical occupations	0.108*	(0.043)	0.079	(0.040)	0.071	(0.040)
Service occupations	0.049	(0.040)	0.047	(0.039)	0.040	(0.038)
Agric./craft occupations	-0.030	(0.040)	-0.016	(0.038)	-0.022	(0.039)
Urban resident	0.034	(0.017)	0.011	(0.014)	0.011	(0.014)
Children in household	-0.030	(0.026)	-0.027	(0.028)	-0.027	(0.028)
Church attendance	0.056***	(0.010)	0.056***	(0.009)	0.056***	(0.009)
Catholic	-0.035	(0.028)	-0.030	(0.026)	0.031	(0.043)
Other religion	0.153***	(0.028)	0.143***	(0.027)	0.143***	(0.027)
No religion	0.031	(0.035)	0.011	(0.033)	0.017	(0.034)
Attitudes						
Political efficacy			0.099***	(0.012)	0.098***	(0.012)
Trust in government			0.012	(0.012)	0.012	(0.012)
Social trust			0.129***	(0.014)	0.128***	(0.014)
Left political affiliation			0.127***	(0.036)	0.128***	(0.035)
Right political affiliation			-0.218***	(0.039)	-0.215***	(0.038)
Other political affiliation			-0.093*	(0.044)	-0.091	(0.044)
Gender interactions						
Female*Catholic					-0.118*	(0.048)
Constant	3.902	(0.097)	3.571	(0.119)	3.548	(0.113)
R-squared	0.116		0.145		0.146	

Source: ISSP 2004.

Notes: * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

as more important than men. Women, in other words, have a stronger belief that good citizens should help others in and outside the country, should shop in a politically, ethically and/or environmentally responsible way, and should try to understand people with opinions differing from their own. This holds regardless of socio-economic and attitudinal characteristics. Women and men only differ in one effect – Catholicism – which depresses women's greater tendency to stress social citizenship importance.

In sum, after controlling for a variety of socio-economic variables and relevant attitudes, men and women find political responsibilities of similar importance. Yet, women place significantly greater emphasis on the importance of civil and social responsibilities. Some demographic or attitudinal items matter differently for men and women. One such a gender pattern is that religious characteristics such as church attendance and being Catholic has a stronger positive influence on the importance of responsibilities for men as compared to women. Men on average attend church less frequently and are less likely to identify as Catholic than women, but among men who do attend church or consider themselves Catholic, these characteristics have a more positive influence than for similar women.

Citizenship rights

As mentioned earlier, citizenship rights are inherently linked to responsibilities in democracies. The bivariate relationships tested in Table I demonstrated that women and men differ significantly with respect to their perceived importance of citizenship rights, women being more supportive of political, and civil and social rights. In the following section, we investigate whether these differences hold after controlling for socio-demographic variables and attitudes.

Political rights

The first models speak to support for political rights, or agreement that the government should give more weight to citizen views and increase opportunities for participation. (See results in Table V.) Both a base socio-economic model and a model including attitudes suggest women place greater importance on political citizenship rights. Thus, even when controlling for these major sources of difference, a gender gap remains. Tests for interaction effects indicate two gender differences: having a professional occupation and levels of political efficacy. These indicate female professionals find political rights to be significantly more important than male professionals, and the same is true of political efficacy, where men's increased political efficacy leads to stronger declines in the perceived importance of political rights than it does for women. There is no significant gender difference, however, among the

Table V: OLS regression analyses of political citizenship rights support in 18 Western industrialized democracies (robust standard errors in parentheses); $N = 20,560$

	Socio-economic		Attitudes		Gender interactions	
Gender						
Female	0.153***	(0.023)	0.134***	(0.023)	0.038	(0.030)
Socio-economic controls						
University degree	-0.109***	(0.023)	-0.083***	(0.023)	-0.084***	(0.024)
Age	0.010*	(0.004)	0.008*	(0.004)	0.008*	(0.004)
Age-squared	-0.000*	(0.000)	-0.000	(0.000)	-0.000	(0.000)
Married/living as/widow	0.004	(0.030)	0.010	(0.030)	0.016	(0.030)
Divorced/separated	0.035	(0.030)	0.028	(0.030)	0.033	(0.030)
Employed full time	-0.030	(0.020)	-0.023	(0.020)	-0.020	(0.020)
Not in labour force	-0.020	(0.024)	-0.022	(0.024)	-0.019	(0.025)
Spouse employed full time	-0.023	(0.019)	-0.017	(0.018)	-0.018	(0.018)
Professional occupations	-0.072	(0.039)	-0.041	(0.034)	-0.118***	(0.038)
Technical occupations	-0.017	(0.035)	0.004	(0.034)	-0.002	(0.033)
Service occupations	0.014	(0.035)	0.022	(0.034)	0.027	(0.033)
Agric./craft occupations	0.042	(0.025)	0.035	(0.025)	0.013	(0.025)
Urban resident	-0.055***	(0.018)	-0.054***	(0.016)	-0.054***	(0.016)
Children in household	0.009	(0.018)	0.009	(0.019)	0.011	(0.018)
Church attendance	-0.013*	(0.006)	-0.005	(0.006)	-0.004	(0.005)
Catholic	0.022	(0.030)	0.015	(0.027)	0.016	(0.027)
Other religion	0.051	(0.040)	0.027	(0.037)	0.025	(0.037)
No religion	0.009	(0.028)	-0.019	(0.027)	-0.019	(0.028)
Attitudes						
Political efficacy			-0.064***	(0.016)	-0.081***	(0.017)
Trust in government			-0.084***	(0.010)	-0.083***	(0.010)
Social trust			-0.007	(0.016)	-0.008	(0.016)
Left political affiliation			0.123***	(0.026)	0.119***	(0.025)
Right political affiliation			-0.029	(0.038)	-0.028	(0.037)
Other political affiliation			0.026	(0.029)	0.024	(0.028)
Gender interactions						
Female*professional occup.					0.156***	(0.025)
Female*political efficacy					0.031*	(0.013)
Constant	5.100	(0.094)	5.363	(0.085)	5.407	(0.085)
R-squared	0.042		0.061		0.062	

Source: ISSP 2004.

Notes: * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

reference groups – those without an occupation or with an elementary occupation and those with low levels of political efficacy – since the main gender effect is no longer significant.

Civil and social rights

In turning to support for civil and social rights, measured as desire for an equitable standard of living and support for government protection for minority and varying status group rights, we see again that women place more importance on these rights than men across the base socio-economic and

Table VI: OLS regression analyses of civil and social citizenship rights support in 18 Western industrialized democracies (robust standard errors in parentheses); *N* = 20,560

	Socio-economic		Attitudes		Gender interactions	
Gender						
Female	0.116***	(0.023)	0.111***	(0.022)	0.228***	(0.047)
Socio-economic controls						
University degree	0.032	(0.016)	0.012	(0.018)	0.010	(0.018)
Age	0.014***	(0.003)	0.013***	(0.003)	0.015***	(0.003)
Age-squared	-0.000***	(0.000)	-0.000***	(0.000)	-0.000***	(0.000)
Married/living as/widow	-0.039	(0.026)	-0.033	(0.024)	-0.029	(0.024)
Divorced/separated	0.031	(0.024)	0.037	(0.023)	0.038	(0.024)
Employed full time	-0.052*	(0.023)	-0.043	(0.023)	-0.035	(0.023)
Not in labour force	0.019	(0.019)	0.024	(0.019)	0.027	(0.019)
Spouse employed full time	-0.001	(0.016)	-0.002	(0.016)	-0.007	(0.015)
Professional occupations	-0.003	(0.031)	0.004	(0.030)	-0.067	(0.033)
Technical occupations	0.012	(0.034)	0.012	(0.033)	0.001	(0.032)
Service occupations	0.038	(0.031)	0.043	(0.031)	0.040	(0.029)
Agric./craft occupations	0.005	(0.025)	0.010	(0.024)	-0.011	(0.025)
Urban resident	-0.010	(0.023)	-0.019	(0.022)	-0.019	(0.021)
Children in household	-0.010	(0.019)	-0.008	(0.019)	-0.009	(0.019)
Church attendance	0.003	(0.006)	0.007	(0.005)	0.007	(0.005)
Catholic	-0.003	(0.024)	-0.008	(0.021)	-0.008	(0.021)
Other religion	0.120***	(0.027)	0.098***	(0.025)	0.157***	(0.034)
No religion	0.025	(0.019)	0.002	(0.015)	0.004	(0.015)
Attitudes						
Political efficacy			0.001	(0.010)	0.000	(0.010)
Trust in government			0.007	(0.008)	0.007	(0.008)
Social trust			0.061***	(0.010)	0.061***	(0.010)
Left political affiliation			0.113***	(0.027)	0.110***	(0.027)
Right political affiliation			-0.175***	(0.027)	-0.173***	(0.027)
Other political affiliation			-0.021	(0.024)	-0.022	(0.024)
Gender interactions						
Female*age					-0.003***	(0.001)
Female*professional occup.					0.132***	(0.025)
Female*other religion					-0.112*	(0.047)
Constant	4.907	(0.107)	4.831	(0.105)	4.763	(0.111)
R-squared	0.056		0.072		0.074	

Source: ISSP 2004.

Notes: * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

attitudinal model in Table VI. The analysis indicates that socio-economic and attitudinal differences between men and women cannot explain the gender gap and women are still more likely to engage in these activities. Three significant gender-interaction effects emerged. First, while the main effect of age is positive, though it decreases at higher ages, this positive trajectory is less for women. Next, female professionals are more likely to say civil and social rights are important than are male professionals. Finally, while people having an 'other' religion are more supportive of these citizenship rights, this positive effect is significantly weaker for women.

Overall, the analyses of the importance of political rights and civil and social rights present similar pictures with respect to gender differences. Females are more supportive of these rights than males. For both political rights and social and civil rights, a significant gender interaction term was found for professional occupation: a professional occupation having a significant more positive effect for women than for men. Given women's lower likelihood of being a professional, it may be that female professionals have fought certain types of discrimination that make them more sensitive to issues of political and civil and social rights.

Conclusion: a gender gap in citizenship?

Do men and women define citizenship differently? The answer is generally yes. In comparing support for a variety of citizenship norms, women placed more emphasis on social and civil responsibilities and rights as well as on political rights than men. However, on one important dimension the answer is no – political citizenship responsibilities, where men and women do not differ in their opinion on the importance of these responsibilities. We should emphasize that the study is not limited to one nation, but rather considers opinions and characteristics across the 18 Western industrialized democracies. All results hold controlling for nation-specific effects, and remain robust after controlling for socio-demographic and attitudinal characteristics. While we expected gender differences in citizenship norms to be largely due to socio-economic and attitudinal differences as suggested by previous citizenship research, this was not the case.

Why, regardless of such characteristics, are women so much more supportive of civil and social citizenship than men? We suspect that issues of gender role socialization or specific life-course effects might be key in understanding differences between men's and women's support for social and civil rights and duties. Scholarship on childhood and adult socialization demonstrates that gender is ingrained early and often (Martin 1998; West and Fenstermaker 1995) and with this comes a set of overarching values and ideologies that may alter men and women's approach to social issues. Thus, if women place more importance on civil and social citizenship it may be based on gender role expectations that women should be more submissive, private, rule-abiding, and compassionate, while men are oriented towards political citizenship since their gender role expectations emphasize leadership, public roles, autonomy and self-reliance (Brownmiller 1984; Fox and Lawless 2004; West and Zimmerman 1987; Beutel and Marini 1995). Rather than values of competition and aggression, women are pressured to develop an 'ethic of caring,' and as such, this ethic predisposes women to think more socially and less in terms of individual gain than men (Coffé and Geys 2007; Jelen, Thomas, and Wilcox

1994; Studlar, McAllister, and Hayes 1998; Chaney, Alvarez, and Nagler 1998; Cross and Madson 1997; Studlar, McAllister, and Hayes 1998).

While we expected women to view political rights and responsibilities as less important, the lack of a gender difference in support for political responsibilities and women's greater support of political rights echoes some recent research claiming that gender gaps in women's political participation are either non-existent or small enough to be irrelevant (Norris 2002; Parry, Moyser and Day 1992). While the role of women in a number of more powerful political arenas still lags, such as being elected to political office, the good news is that even such high resource participation has increased dramatically, and perhaps especially in less visible and/or in local domains (Burns 2007; Harrison and Munn 2007; Sarvasy and Siim 1994). Gender equality in political conceptions of citizenship and participation as citizens may be important steps in supporting equality at higher levels.

Our study has shown the need to consider citizenship in a broader perspective and not limit it to the public and political variant of citizenship. In fact, women may participate to a greater degree than men when citizenship is conceptualized as more than formal politics. Based on this, future studies should test whether gender differences in participation are more pronounced outside of more traditional political behaviours such as voting or party membership. Another important next step for future research will be looking more specifically at linkages between citizenship norms and behaviour in each of these three domains. While we suggested above that women's greater emphasis on civil and social citizenship may reflect and be related to greater commitments to related behaviour, we cannot be sure until we examine the link between conceptions of citizenship and behaviour. The relationship between citizenship norms and citizenship behaviour may not (always) be a direct one. More specifically, it may be that women's concurrent emphasis on social and civil citizenship undermines their time for and interest in formal political participation. In other words, women may value political citizenship similarly to men, but their relatively greater commitment to social and civil citizenship may pull them toward less explicitly political types of participation. This interesting possibility is beyond the scope of the present research but prior research has often found women to be more involved in non-political civil life (Burns 2007). Perhaps further, fine-grained research can address such interconnections.

While survey items such as the ones we have analysed here provide large-scale testable data, we cannot explore answers 'off-script'. For example, when respondents are asked the importance of buying or boycotting items for ethical or political reasons, what does this mean to them? How might a choice to buy have different implications than a choice to boycott? Are citizens' ethical and political reasoning always the same or do they diverge in more complex ways – and in particular according to gender?

Finally, our focus was on exploring differences between men and women regardless of nation, future research can usefully explore the influence of national context and between nation differences. The meaning of responsibilities and rights may be strongly influenced by a variety of national-level characteristics. In particular, welfare state regimes – which are associated with social rights and solidarity as well as civil obligations – may influence citizenship rights and duties (O'Connor 1993; O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; Janoski 1998), and macro measures such as women's political achievements may have more over-arching effects such that in nations that elect more women to office, women and men may be more equal on a variety of citizenship measures (Burns, Schlozman and Verba 2001; Sapiro and Conover 1997). Much is at stake when it comes to debates over citizenship, thus understanding such influences from a variety of perspectives, including the public opinion approach utilized here, will no doubt help both researchers and policy-makers better address citizenship equality in years to come.

(Date accepted: September 2009)

Notes

1. This research was financially supported by the University of California and Utrecht University Collaborative Grant Program and the UCI Center for the Study of Democracy. We thank Judy Treas, Tanja van der Lippe and Russell Dalton for their helpful suggestions, and Vincent Buskens for methodological comments. Both authors contributed equally to this work. Please address all correspondence to Catherine Bolzendahl; University of California, Irvine; Department of Sociology; 3151 Social Science Plaza; Irvine, California 92697.

2. Marshall (1950) originally described these as progressive, though as gender scholars have noted women often obtained these rights in a different order than men (Lister 2003; Siim 2000). Further, a developmental sequence best describes western democracies and is less applicable outside that realm, however, since our sample is comprised entirely of such nations, the distinctions remain useful.

3. Research looking at social rights is often conflated with the study of welfare state provision, rather than social citizenship

per se (Brooks and Manza 2007; Esping-Andersen 2002; O'Connor, Orloff and Shaver 1999). Research on civil and social rights tends to focus on a particular substantive concern and social group, such as marital rights for same-sex couples, or employment rights for minority racial groups (Haider-Markel and Joslyn 2005; Josephson 2005; Quadagno 2000).

4. The ISSP only includes data for the Belgian Dutch-speaking region Flanders.

5. Missing values were distributed randomly and did not heavily alter the distribution of observations between nations.

6. Among the responsibility items, varimax rotated principle component analysis provides a three factor solution as is followed in the analysis. One item has theoretical relevance to two categories: being active in social and political organizations. While factor solutions indicate it belongs in the political responsibilities scale, alpha scores show it can scale with social responsibilities, however if it is removed from the political responsibility scale the fit of this scale suffers. Among the citizenship rights items, factor scores show one scale, though

alpha scores support the two-scale method as do our theoretical concerns.

7. Only two differences are noted. Among political responsibility items women are more likely to vote, among for civil and social rights women are only a marginally more likely to place more importance on whether the government authorities should treat everybody equally regardless of their position in society ($p = 0.06$).

8. While the factor analysis supports a tripartite categorization of the items, it was our theoretical decision to label these emergent latent factors as political, civil and social dimensions.

9. As with the responsibilities, it would theoretically have been interesting to distinguish civil, social and political responsibilities. Yet, this would have left only one variable (provision of an adequate standard of living) to assess social rights. Further, in comparison to the responsibility items, it is less clear for the items which refer to civil and which to social rights. This was confirmed in a factor analysis which suggested that respondents did not distinguish between the two categories of citizenship responsibilities.

10. Previous research revealed that most of the variation in educational attainment arises between high school completion and decisions to enter postsecondary education (Kam and Palmer 2008). Additionally more nuanced measures of education are difficult to construct in comparing samples with such a wide variety of nations in which educational systems vary widely.

11. We also tested an expanded measure of this variable that was the same as respondent's employment, but to lower levels of multicollinearity we reduced this to a dichotomous measure. This did not affect the main results.

12. Separating those with elementary occupations from those with no occupation does not change the main results. Due to a very large number of missing values on income, it was not possible to include this measure, however, occupation may be a more useful concept overall given that it taps into differential earnings groups, and latent

aspects of social class (Abbott 1993). Overall 15 per cent of income values were missing, and these were distributed unequally by nation, with Spain for example, missing over 20 per cent on the income variable.

13. A more nuanced measure of household composition was also measured which divided household according to single adult with children households, all adult households, and two or more adults and one or more children households. None were significant, thus a more parsimonious measure was chosen.

14. Note that the explanation of citizenship norms our attitudinal variables may face problems of reverse causality, however we are more concerned with whether a relationship between the sets of attitudes and how this may explain gender differences, rather than assuming a causal ordering.

15. The inclusion of country dummy variables is similar to creating a fixed-effects model in multi-level analyses, and controls for differences which are not independent within nations. Thus we do not focus on explaining differences between countries, but rather gender patterns that emerged *regardless* of nation.

16. Additional tests for model robustness were conducted. In models with a more fine-grained measure of spousal employment, variance inflation factors (VIFs) indicated problematic correlation with measures of respondent's employment, occupation, and marital status. To reduce the potential negative effects of this we reduced our control of spousal employment to a dichotomous variable that compared respondents whose spouse was employed full time to all others (including those with no spouse). This solved the issue, and changes none of our main results. Potentially influential outliers were explored using Grubb's test (STATA10). No outliers were identified in the responsibility items; however outliers were identified among the rights items as primarily being those respondents who felt rights were unimportant. Dropping these outliers did not affect the main gender results, thus they were not detected.

Bibliography

- Abbott, A.** 1993 'The Sociology of Work and Occupations', *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 187–209.
- Abramson, P.R.** 1983 *Political Attitudes in America*, San Francisco, CA: Freeman and Co.
- Allison, P.** 2001 *Missing Data*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Banducci, S.A., Donovan, T., and Karp, J.F.** 1999 'Minority Representation, Empowerment and Participation', *Journal of Politics* 66: 534–56.
- Beckwith, K.** 1986 *American Women and Political Participation: The Impacts of Work, Generation, and Feminism*, Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Bennett, L.L.M. and Bennett, S.E.** 1989 'Enduring Gender Differences in Political Interest. The Impact of Socialization and Political Dispositions', *American Politics Quarterly* 17(1): 105–22.
- Beutel, A.M. and Marini, M.M.** 1995 'Gender and Values', *American Sociological Review* 60: 436–48.
- Bittman, M., England, P., Sayer, L.C., Folbre, N. and Matheson, G.** 2003 'When Does Gender Trump Money? Bargaining and Time in Household Work', *American Journal of Sociology* 109(1): 186–214.
- Bolzendahl, C. and Brooks, C.** 2005 'Polarization, Secularization or Differences as Usual? The Denominational Cleavage in U.S. Social Attitudes Since the 1970s', *The Sociological Quarterly* 46: 47–78.
- Bolzendahl, C. and Myers, D.** 2004 'Feminist Attitudes and Support for Gender Equality: Opinion Change in Women and Men, 1974–1998', *Social Forces* 83: 759–90.
- Bourque, S. and Grossholtz, J.** 1998 'Politics an Unnatural Practice: Political Science Looks at Female Participation' in A. Phillips (ed.) *Feminism and Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brady, H.E., Verba, S., and Schlozman, K.L.** 1995 'Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation', *The American Political Science Review* 89: 271–94.
- Brooks, C. and Manza, J.** 2007 *Why Welfare States Persist: The Importance of Public Opinion in Democracies*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brownmiller, S.** 1984 *Femininity*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Burns, N.** 2007 'Gender in the Aggregate, Gender in the Individual, Gender and Political Action', *Politics & Gender* 3: 104–24.
- Burns, N., Schlozman, K.L. and Verba, S.** 1997 'The Public Consequences of Private Inequality: Family Life and Citizen Participation', *American Political Science Review* 91: 373–89.
- Burns, N., Schlozman, K.L. and Verba, S.** 2001 *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Campbell, R.** 2004 'Gender, Ideology and Issue Preference: Is There such a Thing as a Political Women's Interest in Britain?' *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 6: 20–44.
- Casper, L.M., Garfinkel, I. and McLanahan, S.S.** 1994 'The Gender-Poverty Gap: What We Can Learn from Other Countries', *American Sociological Review* 59: 594–605.
- Caul, M.** 1999 'Women's Representation in Parliament: The Role of Political Parties', *Party Politics* 5(1): 79–98.
- Chaney, C.K., Alvarez, M., and Nagler, J.** 1998 'Explaining the Gender Gap in U.S. Presidential Elections, 1980–1992', *Political Research Quarterly* 51(2): 311–39.
- Chanley, V.A., Rudolph, T.J., and Rahn, W.M.** 2000 'The Origins and Consequences of Public Trust in Government', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64: 239–56.
- Coffé, H. and Geys, B.** 2007 'Participation in Bridging and Bonding Associations and Civic Attitudes', *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 18(4): 385–406.
- Conover, P., Searing, D., and Crewe, I.** 2004 'The Elusive Ideal of Equal Citizenship: Political Theory and Political Psychology in

- the United and Great Britain', *The Journal of Politics* 66(4): 1036–68.
- Cross, S.E. and Madson, L.** 1997 'Models of the Self: Self-Construals and Gender', *Psychological Bulletin* 122(1): 5–37.
- Dalton, R.J.** 2006 *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Dalton, R.J.** 2008a *The Good Citizen. How a Younger Generation is Reshaping American Politics. Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation*, Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Dalton, R.J.** 2008b 'Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation', *Political Studies* 56: 76–98.
- Delanty, G.** 2000 *Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture, Politics*, Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Denters, B., Gabriel, O., and Torcal, M.** 2007 'Norms of Good Citizenship' in J.W. van Deth, J.R. Montero and A. Westholm (eds) *Citizenship and Involvement in European Democracies, A Comparative Analysis*, Oxon: Routledge.
- DiFrancesco, W. and Gitelman, Z.** 1984 'Soviet Political Culture and "Covert Participation" in Policy Implementation', *American Political Science Review* 78: 603–21.
- Diekmann, A.B., Eagly, A.H. and Kulesa, P.** 2002 'Accuracy and Bias in Stereotypes about the Social and Political Attitudes of Women and Men', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 38: 268–82.
- DiPrete, T.A. and McManus, P.A.** 2000 'Family Change, Employment, Transitions, and the Welfare State: Household Income Dynamics in the United States and Germany', *American Sociological Review* 65: 343–70.
- Erikson, R. and Tedin, K.L.** 2005 *American Public Opinion. Its Origins, Content, and Impact*, New York: Pearson Longman.
- Esping-Andersen, G.** 2002 'A New Gender Contract' in G. Esping-Andersen, D. Gallie, A. Hemerijck and J. Myles (eds) *Why We Need a New Welfare State*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, J.H.** 1997 'Worldviews or Social Groups as the Source of Moral Value Attitudes: Implications for the Culture Wars Thesis', *Sociological Forum* 12(3): 371–404.
- Faulks, K.** 2000 *Citizenship*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Fox, R.L. and Lawless, J.L.** 2004 'Entering the Arena? Gender and the Decision to Run for Office', *American Journal of Political Science* 48(2): 264–80.
- Haider-Markel, D.P. and Joslyn, M.R.** 2005 'Attributions and the Regulation of Marriage: Considering the Parallels Between Race and Homosexuality', *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38: 233–9.
- Harrison, L. and Munn, J.** 2007 'Gendered (Non)participants? What Constructions of Citizenship Tell Us about Democratic Governance in the Twenty-first Century', *Parliamentary Affairs* 60: 426–36.
- Hayes, B.C., McAllistair, I. and Studlar, D.T.** 2000 'Gender, Postmaterialism, and Feminism in Comparative Perspective', *International Political Science Review* 21(4): 425–39.
- Heath, A., Taylor, B. and Toka, G.** 1995 'Religion, Morality and Politics' in R. Jowell, L. Brook, L. Dowds and D. Ahrendt (eds) *International Social Attitudes: The 10th BSA Report*, Aldershot, UK: Dartmouth.
- Hochschild, A.R.** 1989 *The Second Shift*, New York: Avon.
- Hooghe, M.** 2003 'Participation in Voluntary Associations and Value Indicators: The Effect of Current and Previous Participation Experiences', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 32: 47–69.
- Hooghe, M. and Wilkenfeld, B.** 2008 'The Stability of Political Attitudes and Behaviors Across Adolescence and Early Adulthood: A Comparison of Survey Data on Adolescents and Young Adults in Eight Countries', *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 37: 155–67.
- Howard, M.M. and Gilbert, L.** 2008 'A Cross-National Comparison of the Internal Effects of Participation in Voluntary Organizations', *Political Studies* 56(1): 12–32.
- Huckfeldt, R. and Prague, J.** 1995. *Citizens, Politics, and Social Communication*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Inglehart, R. and Norris, P.** 2000 'The Developmental Theory of the Gender Gap: Women's and Men's Voting Behavior in Global Perspective', *International Political Science Review* 21: 441–63.
- Inglehart, R. and Welzel, C.** 2005 *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ISSP** 2004 'Citizenship' ZA No. 3950: www.esis.org/en/data_service/issp/data/2004_Citizenship.htm.
- Janoski, T.** 1998 *Citizenship and Civil Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jelen, Ted G., Thomas, S. and Wilcox, C.** 1994 'The Gender Gap in Comparative Perspective', *European Journal of Political Research* 25(2): 171–86.
- Josephson, J.** 2005 'Citizenship, Same-Sex Marriage, and Feminist Critiques of Marriage', *Perspectives on Politics* 3: 269–84.
- Kam, C.D. and Palmer, C.L.** 2008 'Reconsidering the Effects of Education on Political Participation', *Journal of Politics* 70(3): 612–31.
- Kenski, K. and Jamieson, K.H.** 2000 'The Gender Gap in Political Knowledge: Are Women Less Knowledgeable than Men about Politics?' in K.H. Jamieson, *Everything You Think You Know About Politics... And Why You're Wrong*, New York: Basic Books.
- Kilkey, M. and Bradshaw, J.** 1999 'Lone Mothers, Economic Well-Being, and Policies' in D. Sainsbury (ed.) *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Knudsen, K. and Wærness, K.** 2008 'National Context and Spouses Housework in 34 Countries', *European Sociological Review* 24(1): 97–113.
- Lijphart, A.** 1984 *Democracies: Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-One Countries*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lijphart, A.** 1997 'Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma', *The American Political Science Review* 91: 1–14.
- Lister, R.** 1995 'Dilemmas in Engendering Citizenship', *Economy and Society* 24(1): 1–40.
- Lister, R.** 1998 'Citizenship and Difference: Towards a Differentiated Universalism', *European Journal of Social Theory* 1(1): 71–90.
- Lister, R.** 2003 *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lister, R., Williams, F., Anttonen, A., Bussemaker, J., Gerhard, U., Heinen, J., Johansson, S., Leira, A., Siim, B., Tobio, C. and Gavanas, A.** 2007 *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe: New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Lovenduski, J.** 2005 *Feminizing Politics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Manza, J. and Brooks, C.** 1998 'The Gender Gap in US Presidential Elections: When? Why? Implications?', *American Journal of Sociology* 103(5): 1235–66.
- Manza, J. and Brooks, C.** 1999 *Social Cleavages and Political Change: Voter Alignment and U.S. Party Coalitions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marshall, T.H.** 1950 *Citizenship and Social Class*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, K.A.** 1998 'Becoming a Gendered Body: Practices of Preschools', *American Sociological Review* 63(4): 494–511.
- McKinnon, C.** 2000 'Civil Citizens' in C. McKinnon and I. Hampsher-Monk (eds) *The Demands of Citizenship*, New York: Continuum.
- Mead, L.** 1986 *Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship*, New York: The Free Press.
- Norris, P.** 1999 *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Government*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Norris, P.** 2002 *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Novak, M. and Cogan, J., Eds.** 1987 *A Community of Self-Reliance: The New Consensus on Family and Welfare*, Milwaukee: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

- O'Connor, J.S.** 1993 'Gender, Class and Citizenship in the Comparative Analysis of Welfare State Regimes: Theoretical and Methodological Issues', *The British Journal of Sociology* 44: 501–18.
- O'Connor, J.S., Orloff, A.S. and Shaver, S.** 1999 *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orloff, A.S.** 1993 'Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States', *American Sociological Review* 58(June): 303–28.
- Parry, G., Moyser, G. and Day, N.** 1992 *Political Participation and Democracy in Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paxton, P., Kunovich, S. and Hughes, M.M.** 2007 'Gender in Politics', *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 263–84.
- Phillips, A.** 2004 'Identity Politics: Have We Now Had Enough?' in J. Anderson and B. Siim (eds) *The Politics of Inclusion and Empowerment*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pintor, R.L. and Gratschew, M.** 2002 *Voter Turnout Since 1945: A Global Report*, Stockholm: Int. IDEA. <http://www.idea.int/publications/vt/index.cfm>
- Putnam, R.** 1995 'Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital', *Journal of Democracy* 6(1): 65–78.
- Putnam, R.** 2000 *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Quadagno, J.** 2000 'Another Face of Inequality: Racial and Ethnic Exclusion in the Welfare State', *Social Politics* 7: 229–37.
- Rosenthal, C.S.** 1995 'The Role of Gender in Descriptive Representation', *Political Research Quarterly* 48: 599–611.
- Sandel, M.** 1996 *Democracy's Discontent*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Sapiro, V. and Conover, P.J.** 1997 'The Variable Gender Basis of Electoral Politics', *British Journal of Political Science* 27: 497–523.
- Sarvasy, W. and Siim, B.** 1994 'Gender, Transitions to Democracy, and Citizenship', *Social Politics* 1: 249–55.
- Schlozman, K.L., Burns, N. and Verba, S.** 1994 'Gender and the Pathways to Participation: The Role of Resources', *The Journal of Politics* 56(4): 963–90.
- Schlozman, K.L., Burns, N. and Verba, S.** 1999 'What Happened at Work Today? A Multistage Model of Gender, Employment, and Political Participation', *The Journal of Politics* 61: 29–53.
- Scholz, E., Harkness, J. and Faaß, T.** 2008 'ISSP Study Monitoring 2004', GESIS-Methodenberichte Nr. 2/2008 (www.issp.org)
- Seltzer, R., Newman, J. and Leighton, M.V.** 1997 *Sex as a Political Variable: Women as Candidates and Voters in U.S. Elections*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Shapiro, R.Y. and Mahajan, H.** 1986 'Gender Differences in Policy Preferences: A Summary of Trends From the 1960s to the 1980s', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50(1): 42–61.
- Sherrod, L.R.** 2008 'Adolescents' Perceptions of Rights as Reflected in their Views of Citizenship', *Journal of Social Issues* 64(4): 771–90.
- Siim, B.** 2000 *Gender and Citizenship: Politics and Agency in France, Britain and Denmark*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, V.** 1997 'New Forms of Work Organization', *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 315–39.
- Steffensmeier, D. and Allan, E.** 1996 'Gender and Crime: Toward a Gendered Theory of Female Offending', *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 459–87.
- Stolle, D. and Hooghe, M.** 2005 'Shifting Inequalities? Patterns of Exclusion and Inclusion in Emerging Forms of Political Participation', Paper prepared for Presentation at the 101st Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.
- Studdlar, D.T., McAllister, I. and Hayes, B.** 1998 'Explaining the Gender Gap in Voting:

A Cross-National Analysis', *Social Science Quarterly* 79(4): 779–98.

Torney-Purta, J., Wilkenfeld, B. and Barber, C. 2008 'How Adolescents in 27 Countries Understand, Support, and Practice Human Rights', *Journal of Social Issues* 64(4): 857–80.

Tyler, T.R. 2006 *Why People Obey the Law*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K.L. and Brady, H.E. 1995 *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Verba, S., Burns, N. and Schlozman, K.L. 1997 'Knowing and Caring about Politics: Gender and Political Engagement', *The Journal of Politics* 59(4): 1051–72.

Verba, S., Burns, N. and Schlozman, K.L. 2003 'Unequal at the Starting Line: Creating

Participatory Inequalities across Generations and Among Groups', *The American Sociologist* 34: 45–69.

West, C. and Fenstermaker, S. 1995 'Doing Difference', *Gender & Society* 9(1): 8–37.

West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. 1987 'Doing Gender', *Gender & Society* 1(2): 125–51.

Young, I.M. 1997 *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Young, I.M. 2004 'Situated Knowledge and Democratic Discussions' in J. Anderson and B. Siim (eds) *The Politics of Inclusion and Empowerment*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.